9

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,234	10/09/2003	Kyoung-Won Kim	1572.1171	6537

21171 7590 05/02/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
TAYLOR, BARRY W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/681,234	**Applicant(s)** KIM ET AL.
	Examiner Barry W Taylor	**Art Unit** 2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/9/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 14, 17-22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer et al (6,687,348 hereinafter Cromer) in view of Long (5,377,260).

Regarding claims 1 and 18. Cromer teaches a remote power controller (title and abstract) to enable an electronic device and usable with PSTN, comprising:

a power-on signal generator (see powering up computer when caller id matches in abstract, col. 2 lines 44-64, col. 4 lines 54-65); and a control part to compare caller id with a predetermined id when the caller id and a ring signal are received through PSTN, to control the power-on signal generator to generate the power-on signal when the caller id is identical to the predetermined id (abstract, col. 1 lines 40-56, col. 2 lines 30-64, col. 3 lines 1-64, col. 4 lines 3-65).

Cromer does not control ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller id is different from the predetermined ID.

Long teaches a telephone circuit that detects caller id and performs specific action (abstract). Long teaches caller id used to energize/de-energize relay coils (see RC1 and RC2 figures 3B and 4) which control telephone jacks (see RY1 and RY2 figures 3B and 4) thereby allowing for a telephone or CPE connected to telephone jacks to be selectively controlled (col. 1 lines 6-15, col. 3 lines 23-28, col. 4 line 10 – col. 5 line 20, col. 6 line 57 – col. 7 line 68, col. 8 lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Long into the teachings of Cromer providing for a more useful system that only turns on PC when incoming caller id matches stored telephone numbers and energize relays when no match found as disclosed by Long (see at least col. 8 lines 17-25).

Regarding claim 2. Long teaches switching port (see RC1 and RC2 figures 3B and 4).

Regarding claim 3. Long allows telephone to be connected or disconnected based on incoming caller id (col. 1 lines 6-15, col. 3 lines 23-28, col. 4 line 10 – col. 5 line 20, col. 6 line 57 – col. 7 line 68, col. 8 lines 17-25).

Regarding claims 8, 12, 14 and 24. Long teaches ring signal cut-off (col. 6 lines 64-66).

Regarding claims 9 and 26. Cromer teaches wherein the remote power controller further comprises: a signal reception detector to detect the caller id and the ring signal and to transmit the caller id and ring signal to the control unit (abstract, col. 1 lines 40-56, col. 2 lines 30-64, col. 3 lines 1-64, col. 4 lines 3-65).

Regarding claim 11. Method claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as apparatus and system claims 1 and 18 since the recited apparatus and system would perform the claimed method steps.

Regarding claim 17. Cromer teaches storing predetermined caller id (abstract).

Regarding claim 19. Cromer shows a local computer (see "COMPUTER" top center of figure 2).

Regarding claim 20. Cromer teaches a memory (col. 3 line 6 – col. 4 line 65),

wherein the caller id is a telephone number of the local telephone, and wherein the predetermined id is a telephone number that is stored in memory (abstract, col. 3 line 6 – col. 4 line 65).

Regarding claim 21. Cromer teaches a power-on signal generator (see powering up computer when caller id matches in abstract, col. 2 lines 44-64, col. 4 lines 54-65);

a control unit to compare caller id with a predetermined id, to control the power-on signal generator to generate the power-on signal when the caller id is identical to the predetermined id (abstract, col. 1 lines 40-56, col. 2 lines 30-64, col. 3 lines 1-64, col. 4 lines 3-65).

Cromer does not control ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller id is different from the predetermined ID.

Long teaches a telephone circuit that detects caller id and performs specific action (abstract). Long teaches caller id used to energize/de-energize relay coils (see RC1 and RC2 figures 3B and 4) which control telephone jacks (see RY1 and RY2 figures 3B and 4) thereby allowing for a telephone or CPE connected to telephone jacks to be selectively controlled (col. 1 lines 6-15, col. 3 lines 23-28, col. 4 line 10 – col. 5 line 20, col. 6 line 57 – col. 7 line 68, col. 8 lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Long into the teachings of Cromer providing for a more useful system that only turns on PC when incoming caller id matches stored telephone numbers and energize relays when no match found as disclosed by Long (see at least col. 8 lines 17-25).

Regarding claim 22. Cromer teaches the PC is enabled when it receives power-up signal (see powering up computer when caller id matches in abstract, col. 2 lines 44-64, col. 4 lines 54-65).

2. Claims 4-7, 10, 13, 15-16, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer et al (6,687,348 hereinafter Cromer) in view of Long (5,377,260) further in view of Bagchi et al (5,737,400 hereinafter Bagchi).

Regarding claims 4-7, 15-16 and 23. Cromer in view of Long do not explicitly show on-hook detector used.

Bagchi also teaches remotely controlling an appliance using caller id (title and abstract). Bagchi uses an off-hook detect circuit to determine whether or not a telephone is off-hook thereby allowing user to make voice call (col. 7 lines 28-38).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Bagchi into the teachings of Cromer and Long to provide a more useful system that allows users to make voice call (i.e. voice calls get priority over data calls) when a data connection is established as disclosed by Bagchi (col. 7 lines 28-38).

Regarding claims 10, 13 and 25. Cromer in view of Long do not explicitly show a connection id generator to generate a connection id that is identical to the caller id when the caller id is not identical to the predetermined id, and to transmit the connection id to the remote phone.

Bagchi also teaches remotely controlling an appliance using caller id (title and abstract) wherein caller id is regenerated on the line servicing the subscriber (see lines 15-17 of abstract) in order to forward caller id to nearby telephone if subscriber subscribes to caller id feature (col. 4 lines 11-15, col. 8 lines 26-43). Bagchi uses an off-hook detect circuit to determine whether or not a telephone is off-hook thereby allowing user to make voice call (col. 7 lines 28-38).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Bagchi into the teachings of Cromer and Long in order to forward caller id to nearby telephone if caller id on the incoming line does not match any of those stored in memory as disclosed by Bagchi (col. 8 lines 26-27).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (571) 272-7509, who is available Monday-Friday, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (571) 272-7499. The facsimile phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barry Taylor

Barry W. Taylor
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2600
Art Unit 2643